

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addeas: COMMISSIONER POR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,081	02/03/2004	Holger Bohle	09282.0044-00	1661
60668 7590 01/11/2012 SAP / FINNEGAN, HENDERSON LLP			EXAMINER	
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW			SENSENIG, SHAUN D	
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3629	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/11/2012	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1	UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
2	
3	
4	BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
5	AND INTERFERENCES
6	
7	
8	Ex parte HOLGER BOHLE
9	·
10	
11	Appeal 2010-008038
12	Application 10/772,081
13	Technology Center 3600
14	
15	
16	
17	Before HUBERT C. LORIN, ANTON W. FETTING, and
18	JOSEPH A. FISCHETTI, Administrative Patent Judges.
19	FETTING, Administrative Patent Judge.
20	DECISION ON APPEAL
21	

1	STATEMENT OF THE CASE
2	Holger Bohle (Appellant) seeks review under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) of
3	a final rejection of claims 1-16, the only claims pending in the application on
4	appeal. We have jurisdiction over the appeal pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 6(b)
5	(2002).
6	The Appellant invented to a computer program product, tangibly
7	embodied in an information carrier, for use with a curriculum management
8	system that manages a curriculum comprised of at least a course.
9	(Specification 1:17-19).
10	An understanding of the invention can be derived from a reading of
11	exemplary claim 1, which is reproduced below [bracketed matter and some
12	paragraphing added].
13 14	 A computer program comprising a memory device storing instructions that, when executed by a processor,
15 16	cause the processor to perform a method for managing a curriculum,
17	the method comprising the steps performed by the processor of:
18	[1] scheduling a booking of a course to be taken by a learner,
19 20	wherein the scheduling comprises generating an attendance link
21	that associates the learner with the course,
22 23	the attendance link identifying whether the course is associated with a corresponding curriculum;
2.4	[2] receiving input from the learner

[2] receiving input from the learner

¹ Our decision will make reference to the Appellant's Appeal Brief ("App. Br.," filed January 11, 2010) and Reply Brief ("Reply Br.," filed April 26, 2010), and the Examiner's Answer ("Ans.," mailed April 14, 2010).

Appeal 2010-008038 Application 10/772,081

requesting a modification to the booking: [3] determining whether the booking represents an individual booking or a curriculum booking 4 based on the generated attendance link; 5 and 6 [4] processing the modification to the booking 7 based on at least whether the booking represents an 8 individual booking or a curriculum booking. 9 10 The Examiner relies upon the following prior art: Schloss US 5.692,125 Nov. 25, 19971 Aug. 8, 2000 Papadopoulos US 6.099,320 Jan. 17, 2006 Alcorn US 6,988,138 B1 The Columbia Institute, e-Campus School Policy Manual, November 12 2002 (3 pages) 13 Claims 1-6 and 9-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as 14 unpatentable over Schloss. 15 Claims 7 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable 16 over Schloss and Columbia. 17 Claims 8 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable 18 19 over Schloss and Papadopoulos. 20 ISSUE 21 The issue of obviousness turns on whether there is evidence as to the predictability of using a link to determine whether a booking represents an 22 23 individual booking or a curriculum booking as required by limitations [1]. [3], and [4]. 24

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26 27

FACTS PERTINENT TO THE ISSUES. The following enumerated Findings of Fact (FF) are believed to be supported by a preponderance of the evidence. 4 Facts Related to the Prior Art 5 Schloss 6 01. Schloss is directed to computer scheduling of events and event groups that allows a scheduler to schedule events at a schedule time and to account for changing external data and conditions that 8 occur between the schedule time and an event performance time. 9 The computer scheduling of events and event groups allows a 10 scheduler to schedule partially defined events and/or groups of events Schloss 2:16-25 Alcorn 13 02. Alcorn is directed to a way of exchanging information between 14 instructors and students in an education context. Alcorn 1:17-19. 15 ANALYSIS 16 We are persuaded by the Appellant's argument that 17

The Examiner conceded that Schloss "does not explicitly disclose wherein a link is created to associate the user with the event and event information ... [and] does not explicitly disclose using the link to determine whether the booking represents an individual booking or a curriculum booking." Final Office Action, pp. 5-6. However, the Examiner then alleged that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to have included" the above-noted features. See Final Office Action, pp. 5-6. As support for this allegation, the Examiner cited the KSR

decision, quoting that "[t]he combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results." Final Office Action, p. 5 and p. 6. However, the proposition cited by the Examiner is not applicable, for at least the reason that the Examiner has not demonstrated that the elements sought to be combined are "known."

Appeal Br. 13-14. The Examiner found that

Schloss does not explicitly disclose using the link to determine whether the booking represents an individual booking or a curriculum booking, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to have included using the link to determine whether the booking represents an individual booking or a curriculum booking in order to increase efficiency by using already established information to ensure that unnecessary or repetitive activity is minimized (See KSR [127 S Ct. at 1739] "The combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results."), since doing so could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

Ans. 5. The Examiner then went on in the Response section to draw in Alcorn for evidentiary support. Ans. 13. As the Appellant further argued in response to this new evidence, however,

the "hyperlink" of Alcorn is a hyperlink provided on a web page, linking to other information such as announcements, instructors, etc. By clicking a hyperlink, the user can view various information. See, e.g., Alcorn, col. 4, I. 56 - col. 5, I. 15. The "hyperlink" of Alcorn is not an "attendance link that associates the learner with the course" as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). Therefore, Schloss and Alcorn, whether taken alone or in combination, still fail to teach or suggest "an attendance link that associates the learner with the course, the attendance link identifying whether the course is associated with a corresponding curriculum" as recited in claim 1.

	Appleal 2010-008038 Application 10/772,081
1	Reply Br. 5.
2	Both of the only 2 independent claims contain this same limitation.
3	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
4	The rejection of claims 1-6 and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as
5	unpatentable over Schloss is improper.
6	The rejection of claims 7 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as
7	unpatentable over Schloss and Columbia is improper.
8	The rejection of claims 8 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as
9	unpatentable over Schloss and Papadopoulos is improper.
10	DECISION
11	The rejection of claims 1-16 is reversed.
12	
13	REVERSED
14	
15	
16	

17 MP